

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 36418/36419/36422

| | | |
|---------------------------|---|----------------------------------|
| STATE OF IDAHO, |) | 2009 Unpublished Opinion No. 744 |
| |) | |
| Plaintiff-Respondent, |) | Filed: December 31, 2009 |
| |) | |
| v. |) | Stephen W. Kenyon, Clerk |
| |) | |
| BRUCE THOMAS BARRACLOUGH, |) | THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED |
| |) | OPINION AND SHALL NOT |
| Defendant-Appellant. |) | BE CITED AS AUTHORITY |
| |) | |

Appeal from the District Court of the Fourth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Ada County. Hon. Michael E. Wetherell, Hon. Deborah A. Bail, District Judges.

Judgments of conviction and concurrent unified sentences of seven years, with a minimum period of confinement of three years, for possession of methamphetamine; ten years with a minimum period of confinement of four years, for burglary; and seven years with a minimum period of confinement of two years for possession of methamphetamine, affirmed.

Molly J. Huskey, State Appellate Public Defender; Jason C. Pintler, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

Hon. Lawrence G. Wasden, Attorney General; Lori A. Fleming, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

Before LANSING, Chief Judge, GUTIERREZ, Judge
and GRATTON, Judge

PER CURIAM

These cases are consolidated on appeal. In Docket Nos. 36418 and 36419, Bruce Thomas Barraclough was convicted of possession of methamphetamine, Idaho Code § 37-2732(c), and burglary, I.C. § 18-1401. The district court imposed a unified sentence of seven years, with three years determinate for possession of methamphetamine, and a concurrent unified sentence of ten years with four years determinate for burglary, suspended both sentences and placed Barraclough on supervised probation. In Docket No. 36422, Barraclough was convicted of possession of methamphetamine in violation of his probation in the underlying cases. The

district court imposed a unified sentence of seven years with two years determinate, revoked probation in Docket Nos. 36418 and 36419, and ordered the sentences to run concurrently. Barraclough appeals, contending that the sentences are excessive.

Sentencing is a matter for the trial court's discretion. Both our standard of review and the factors to be considered in evaluating the reasonableness of a sentence are well established and need not be repeated here. *See State v. Hernandez*, 121 Idaho 114, 117-18, 822 P.2d 1011, 1014-15 (Ct. App. 1991); *State v. Lopez*, 106 Idaho 447, 449-51, 680 P.2d 869, 871-73 (Ct. App. 1984); *State v. Toohill*, 103 Idaho 565, 568, 650 P.2d 707, 710 (Ct. App. 1982). When reviewing the length of a sentence, we consider the defendant's entire sentence. *State v. Oliver*, 144 Idaho 722, 726, 170 P.3d 387, 391 (2007). Applying these standards, and having reviewed the record in this case, we cannot say that the district court abused its discretion.

Therefore, Barraclough's judgments of conviction and sentences are affirmed.